

Issue: Group III Written Notice with Termination (client abuse); Hearing Date: 09/17/12; Decision Issued: 09/18/12; Agency: DBHDS; AHO: Carl Wilson Schmidt, Esq.; Case No. 9886; Outcome: No Relief – Agency Upheld.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Human Resource Management

OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT DISPUTE RESOLUTION

DECISION OF HEARING OFFICER

In re:

Case Number: 9886

Hearing Date: September 17, 2012

Decision Issued: September 18, 2012

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 9, 2012, Grievant was issued a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action with removal for client abuse.

On July 23, 2012, Grievant timely filed a grievance to challenge the Agency's action. The outcome of the Third Resolution Step was not satisfactory to the Grievant and she requested a hearing. On August 13, 2012, the Office of Employment Dispute Resolution assigned this appeal to the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer found just cause to extend the time frame for issuing a decision in this case due to the unavailability of a party. On September 17, 2012, a hearing was held at the Agency's office.

APPEARANCES

Grievant
Agency Representative
Witnesses

ISSUES

1. Whether Grievant engaged in the behavior described in the Written Notice?
2. Whether the behavior constituted misconduct?

3. Whether the Agency's discipline was consistent with law (e.g., free of unlawful discrimination) and policy (e.g., properly characterized as a Group I, II, or III offense)?
4. Whether there were mitigating circumstances justifying a reduction or removal of the disciplinary action, and if so, whether aggravating circumstances existed that would overcome the mitigating circumstances?

BURDEN OF PROOF

The burden of proof is on the Agency to show by a preponderance of the evidence that its disciplinary action against the Grievant was warranted and appropriate under the circumstances. Grievance Procedure Manual ("GPM") § 5.8. A preponderance of the evidence is evidence which shows that what is sought to be proved is more probable than not. GPM § 9.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the evidence presented and observing the demeanor of each witness, the Hearing Officer makes the following findings of fact:

The Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services employed Grievant as a Direct Service Associate II at one of its facilities. No evidence of prior active disciplinary action was introduced during the hearing.

Grievant received training on an annual basis regarding the Agency's prohibition against client abuse under Departmental Instruction 201.

On July 2, 2012, between 12:25 a.m. and 1 a.m., Grievant moved the Patient from his room through the hallway and to the restroom. The hallway was quiet at that time and Grievant's voice carried throughout the hallway. Ms. S was located approximately 65 feet down the hallway and heard Grievant say to the Patient, "You have s—t all over yourself. Damn you. What a freaking mess." The Supervisor was making her rounds and was standing approximately ten feet from Grievant when she spoke with the Patient. The Supervisor overheard Grievant say to the Patient, "Damn it, you have pissed in your pants again. Well s—t."

CONCLUSIONS OF POLICY

The Agency has a duty to the public to provide its clients with a safe and secure environment. It has zero tolerance for acts of abuse or neglect and these acts are punished severely. Departmental Instruction (“DI”) 201 defines¹ client abuse as:

Abuse means any act or failure to act by an employee or other person responsible for the care of an individual that was performed or was failed to be performed knowingly, recklessly or intentionally, and that caused or might have caused physical or psychological harm, injury or death to a person receiving care or treatment for mental illness, mental retardation or substance abuse. Examples of abuse include, but are not limited to, acts such as:

- Rape, sexual assault, or other criminal sexual behavior
- Assault or battery
- Use of language that demeans, threatens, intimidates or humiliates the person;
- Misuse or misappropriation of the person’s assets, goods or property
- Use of excessive force when placing a person in physical or mechanical restraint
- Use of physical or mechanical restraints on a person that is not in compliance with federal and state laws, regulations, and policies, professionally accepted standards of practice or the person’s individual services plan; and
- Use of more restrictive or intensive services or denial of services to punish the person or that is not consistent with his individualized services plan.

For the Agency to meet its burden of proof in this case, it must show that (1) Grievant engaged in an act that she performed knowingly, recklessly, or intentionally and (2) Grievant’s act caused or might have caused physical or psychological harm to the Client. It is not necessary for the Agency to show that Grievant intended to abuse a client – the Agency must only show that Grievant intended to take the action that caused the abuse. It is also not necessary for the Agency to prove a client has been injured by the employee’s intentional act. All the Agency must show is that the Grievant might have caused physical or psychological harm to the client.

On July 1, 2012, Grievant criticized the Patient and emphasized her criticism by using profanity. Her words served to demean and humiliate the Patient.² The Agency has presented sufficient evidence to support the issuance of a Group III Written Notice

¹ See, Va. Code § 37.1-1 and 12 VAC 35-115-30.

² It is not unusual for witnesses of the same event to differ in some portion of their observation of the event. Both witnesses, however, observed Grievant cursing while criticizing the Patient.

for client abuse. Upon the issuance of a Group III Written Notice, an agency may remove an employee. Grievant's removal must be upheld.

Grievant argued that she was not with the Patient until after 2 a.m. and, thus, the Agency's allegations could not be true. Ms. S and the Supervisor overheard Grievant speaking with the Patient. Their testimony was credible. No evidence was presented suggesting they had any motive to fabricate a story about Grievant. Grievant did not testify and, thus, the Hearing Officer was unable to assess the credibility of her denial.

Va. Code § 2.2-3005.1 authorizes Hearing Officers to order appropriate remedies including "mitigation or reduction of the agency disciplinary action." Mitigation must be "in accordance with rules established by the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution..."³ Under the *Rules for Conducting Grievance Hearings*, "[a] hearing officer must give deference to the agency's consideration and assessment of any mitigating and aggravating circumstances. Thus, a hearing officer may mitigate the agency's discipline only if, under the record evidence, the agency's discipline exceeds the limits of reasonableness. If the hearing officer mitigates the agency's discipline, the hearing officer shall state in the hearing decision the basis for mitigation." A non-exclusive list of examples includes whether (1) the employee received adequate notice of the existence of the rule that the employee is accused of violating, (2) the agency has consistently applied disciplinary action among similarly situated employees, and (3) the disciplinary action was free of improper motive. In light of this standard, the Hearing Officer finds no mitigating circumstances exist to reduce the disciplinary action.

DECISION

For the reasons stated herein, the Agency's issuance to the Grievant of a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action with removal is **upheld**.

APPEAL RIGHTS

You may file an administrative review request within **15 calendar** days from the date the decision was issued, if any of the following apply:

1. If you believe the hearing decision is inconsistent with state policy or agency policy, you may request the Director of the Department of Human Resource Management to review the decision. You must state the specific policy and explain why you believe the decision is inconsistent with that policy. Please address your request to:

Director
Department of Human Resource Management
101 North 14th St., 12th Floor

³ Va. Code § 2.2-3005.

Richmond, VA 23219

or, send by fax to (804) 371-7401, or e-mail.

2. If you believe that the hearing decision does not comply with the grievance procedure or if you have new evidence that could not have been discovered before the hearing, you may request that EDR review the decision. You must state the specific portion of the grievance procedure with which you believe the decision does not comply. Please address your request to:

Office of Employment Dispute Resolution
Department of Human Resource Management
101 North 14th St., 12th Floor
Richmond, VA 23219

or, send by e-mail to EDR@dhrm.virginia.gov, or by fax to (804) 786-1606.

You may request more than one type of review. Your request must be in writing and must be **received** by the reviewer within 15 calendar days of the date the decision was issued. You must give a copy of all of your appeals to the other party and to EDR. The hearing officer's **decision becomes final** when the 15-calendar day period has expired, or when administrative requests for review have been decided.

You may request a judicial review if you believe the decision is contradictory to law. You must file a notice of appeal with the clerk of the circuit court in the jurisdiction in which the grievance arose within **30 days** of the date when the decision becomes final.⁴

[See Sections 7.1 through 7.3 of the Grievance Procedure Manual for a more detailed explanation, or call EDR's toll-free Advice Line at 888-232-3842 to learn more about appeal rights from an EDR Consultant].

S/Carl Wilson Schmidt

Carl Wilson Schmidt, Esq.
Hearing Officer

⁴ Agencies must request and receive prior approval from EDR before filing a notice of appeal.